



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/767,243 | 01/27/2004 | Mohammad Ali Saffari | 112300-1794 | 8934 |
| 29159 | 7590 | 09/03/2009 | | |
| K&L Gates LLP P.O. Box 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690 | | | EXAMINER KIM, ANDREW | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3714 | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/03/2009 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

chicago.patents@klgates.com

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/767,243 | Applicant(s) SAFFARI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner ANDREW KIM | Art Unit 3714 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ANDREW KIM. (3) Adam Masia.

(2) Dmitry Suhol. (4) Matt Dicke.

Date of Interview: 8/28/09.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Walker.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The participants discussed whether Walker discloses the invention as claimed. Specifically, whether the rejection should be a 102 or 103, difference between Walker's rule versus the claimed present balance cash out, the definition of a casino account and the scope of a certain credit total.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|--|
| | /Dmitry Suhol/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714 |
|--|--|